

REMARKS

Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 8 are amended. Claims 7 and 14 are cancelled without out prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Lee at the interview held February 1, 2006, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

In section 2 on pages 2-3, the Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,345,315 to Shalit. In section 4 on pages 3-4, the Office Action rejects claims 5 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalit and further in view of the U.S. Patent No. 5,196,942 to Shiau. In section 5 on page 4, the Office Action rejects claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shalit in view of the Shiau and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,777,656 to Henderson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended to incorporate the subject matter recited in claims 7 and 14, respectively. Thus, claims 7 and 14 are cancelled without prejudice to, or disclaimer of, the subject matter therein. Claims 1 and 8 are further amended to recite that, "the end point is considered to be a corner of a box, the threshold value is a function of a distance from the point to a nearest wall of the corner, and the threshold value going to zero as the distance to the wall goes to zero." Support for the subject matter can be found in the specification, for example, at page 2, line 31 to page 3, line 2.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art of record, including Shalit, Shiau, and Henderson discloses, teaches, or suggests that, "the end point is considered to be a corner

of a box, the threshold value is a function of a distance from the point to a nearest wall of the corner, and the threshold value going to zero as the distance to the wall goes to zero."

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of claims 1-14 in sections 1-5 on pages 2-4 of the Office Action be withdrawn.

The amendments described above correspond directly to the proposed amendments discussed at the interview. Examiner Lee is thanked for agreeing that the amendments would require further search and/or consideration of the cited prior art. Examiner Lee is also thanked for memorializing this agreement in the Interview Summary.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-6 and 8-13 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better-condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Mark R. Woodall
Registration No. 43,286

JAO:MRW/sxb

Date: February 6, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--